

Appl. No. 10/589,695
Amendment dated July 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of April 11, 2008

REMARKS

In the April 11, 2008 Office Action, claims 1, 4-9, and 11-20 were objected to and claims 1-3, 10, 14, and 19 stand rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

Status of Claims and Amendments

In response to the April 11, 2008 Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, and 20, and has canceled claims 4, 7, 11-13, and 16 as indicated above. Applicant has also added claims 21-24. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the examination of this application. Thus, claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 14, 15, and 17-24 are pending, with claims 1 and 19 being the only independent claims. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

Claim Objections

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4-9, and 11-20 were objected to. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 17-20, and has canceled claims 4, 7, 11-13, and 16.

Specifically, Applicant has deleted the parentheses around the term “L/D1” and has deleted the term “Si” to clarify the claims. Further, Applicant has placed claim 20 in independent form.

Applicant believes that the claims are now correct. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/589,695
Amendment dated July 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of April 11, 2008

Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 10, 14, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,447,246 (Abe et al.). In response, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to recite the limitations of original claim 4. Since these limitations were not rejected by the prior art, Applicant assumes that the USPTO believes that they are allowable.

Moreover, Applicant believes that dependent claims 2, 3, 10, 14, and 19 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicant believes that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 1, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 15, 17, 18, and 20

These claims were not rejected in the body of the Office Action and were objected to in the Office Action Summary, thus, Applicant believes that the USPTO believes these claims to contain allowable subject matter. In response, Applicant has placed claim 19 in independent form.

Prior Art Citation

In the Office Action, additional prior art references were made of record. Applicant believes that these references do not render the claimed invention obvious.

New Claims 21-24

Appl. No. 10/589,695
Amendment dated July 8, 2008
Reply to Office Action of April 11, 2008

Applicant has added new claims 21-24, which ultimately depend on claims 1 and 19. Applicant believes that these claims are allowable for the reasons that claims 1 and 19 are allowable. Applicant believes that claims 21-24 are further allowable because they contain additional limitations.

Examination and consideration are respectfully requested.

* * *

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-10, 14, 15, and 17-24 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Todd M. Guise/
Todd M. Guise
Reg. No. 46,748

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202)-293-0444
Dated: July 8, 2008

S:\07-JUL08-SOS\ED-US040024 Amendment.doc